arXiv:0910.5814v1 [math.GT] 30 Oct 2009

THE SIMPLICIAL VOLUME OF HYPERBOLIC MANIFOLDS WITH GEODESIC BOUNDARY

ROBERTO FRIGERIO AND CRISTINA PAGLIANTINI

Abstract. Let $n \geq 3$, let M be an orientable complete finite volume hyperbolic n-manifold with compact (possibly empty) geodesic boundary, and let $\mathrm{Vol}(M)$ and $\|M\|$ be the Riemannian volume and the simplicial volume of M. A celebrated result by Gromov and Thurston states that if $\partial M = \emptyset$ then $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|M\| = v_n$, where v_n is the volume of the regular ideal geodesic n-simplex in hyperbolic n-space. On the contrary, Jungreis and Kuessner proved that if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ then $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|M\| < v_n$.

We prove here that for every $\eta > 0$ there exists $k > 0$ (only depending on η and n) such that if $\mathrm{Vol}(\partial M)/\mathrm{Vol}(M) \leq k$, then $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|M\| \geq v_n - \eta$. As a consequence we show that for every $\eta > 0$ there exists a compact orientable hyperbolic n-manifold M with non-empty geodesic boundary such that $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|M\| \geq v_n - \eta$.

Our argument also works in the case of empty boundary, thus providing a somewhat new proof of the proportionality principle for non-compact finite-volume hyperbolic n-manifolds without boundary.

1. Preliminaries and statements

Let X be a topological space, let $Y \subseteq X$ be a (possibly empty) subspace of X, and let R be a ring (in the present paper only the cases $R = \mathbb{R}$ and $R = \mathbb{Z}$ will be considered). For $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $C_i(X; R)$ the module of singular i-chains over R, *i.e.* the R-module freely generated by the set $S_i(X)$ of singular i-simplices with values in X. The natural inclusion of Y in X induces an inclusion of $C_i(Y; R)$ into $C_i(X; R)$, so it makes sense to define $C_i(X, Y; R)$ as the quotient space $C_i(X; R)/C_i(Y; R)$ (of course, if $Y = \emptyset$ we get $C_i(X, Y; R) = C_i(X, R)$). The usual differential of the complex $C_*(X; R)$ defines a differential $d_*\colon C_*(X, Y; R) \to C_{*-1}(X, Y; R)$. The homology of the resulting complex is the usual relative singular homology of the topological pair (X, Y), and will be denoted by $H_*(X, Y; R)$.

In what follows, we will denote simply by $C_i(X)$, $C_i(X, Y)$ respectively the modules $C_i(X; \mathbb{R})$, $C_i(X, Y; \mathbb{R})$. The $\mathbb{R}$-vector space $C_i(X, Y)$ can be endowed with the

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C23 (primary); 57N16, 57N65 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. Gromov norm, Straight simplex, Hyperbolic volume, Haar measure, Volume form.

following natural L^1-norm: if $\alpha \in C_i(X,Y)$, then

$$\|\alpha\| = \|\alpha\|_1 = \inf \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in S_i(X)} |a_\sigma| \, , \text{ where } \alpha = \left[\sum_{\sigma \in S_i(X)} a_\sigma \sigma \right] \text{ in } C_i(X)/C_i(Y) \right\}.$$

Such a norm descends to a seminorm on $H_*(X,Y)$, which is defined as follows: if $[\alpha] \in H_i(X,Y)$, then

$$\|[\alpha]\| = \inf\{\|\beta\|,\ \beta \in C_i(X,Y),\ d\beta = 0,\ [\beta] = [\alpha]\}$$

(note that such a seminorm can be null on non-zero elements of $H_*(X,Y)$).

1.1. **Simplicial volume.** Throughout the whole paper, every manifold is assumed to be connected and orientable. If M is a compact n-manifold with (possibly empty) boundary ∂M, then we denote by $[M]_\mathbb{Z}$ a generator of $H_n(M,\partial M;\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Such a generator is usually known as the *fundamental class* of the pair $(M,\partial M)$. The inclusion $\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ induces a map $l\colon H_n(M,\partial M;\mathbb{Z}) \hookrightarrow H_n(M,\partial M;\mathbb{R}) = H_n(M,\partial M) \cong \mathbb{R}$, and we set $[M]_\mathbb{R} = l([M]_\mathbb{Z})$. The following definition is due to Gromov [Gro82, Thu79]:

Definition 1.1. The *simplicial volume* of M is $\|M\| = \|[M]_\mathbb{R}\|$.

Since continuous maps induce norm non-increasing maps on singular chains and a homotopy equivalence of pairs $f\colon (M,\partial M) \to (N,\partial N)$ between n-manifolds maps the fundamental class of M into the fundamental class of N, it is readily seen that the simplicial volume of a compact manifold M is a homotopy invariant of the pair $(M,\partial M)$.

As Gromov pointed out in his seminal work [Gro82], even if it depends only on the homotopy type of a manifold, the simplicial volume is deeply related to the geometric structures that a manifold can carry. For example, closed manifolds which support negatively curved Riemannian metrics have non-vanishing simplicial volume, while the simplicial volume of flat or spherical manifolds is null (see *e.g.* [Gro82]). Even if several vanishing and non-vanishing results for the simplicial volume have been established (see *e.g.* [Gro82, LS06, BK07]), it is maybe worth mentioning that, as far as the authors know, the exact value of non-null simplicial volumes is known at the moment only in the following cases: a celebrated result by Gromov and Thurston (see Theorem 1.2 below) computes the simplicial volume of closed (and cusped) hyperbolic manifolds, and the simplicial volume of the product of compact orientable surfaces has been recently determined in [BK08].

1.2. **The simplicial volume of hyperbolic manifolds.** Let $n \geq 3$. Throughout the whole paper, by *hyperbolic n-manifold* we will mean a complete finite-volume hyperbolic n-manifold M with compact (possibly empty) geodesic boundary. We recall that if M is cusped, *i.e.* if it is non-compact, then M naturally compactifies to a manifold with boundary $\overline{M}$ obtained by adding to M a finite number of boundary $(n-1)$-manifolds supporting a flat structure (see Subsection 2.1 below).

Let v_n be the supremum of volumes of geodesic n-simplices in hyperbolic n-space $\mathbb{H}^n$. It is well-known [HM81, Pey02] that v_n equals in fact the volume of the geodesic regular ideal n-simplex. The following result is due to Thurston and Gromov [Thu79, Gro82] (detailed proofs can be found in [BP92] for the closed case, and in [Fra04, Kue07] for the cusped case):

Theorem 1.2 (Gromov, Thurston)**.** *Suppose M is a hyperbolic n-manifold without boundary. Then $\|\overline{M}\| \neq 0$ and*

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M)}{\|\overline{M}\|} = v_n.$$

A different result holds for hyperbolic manifolds with *non-empty* geodesic boundary:

Theorem 1.3 ([Jun97, Kue03])**.** *Let M be a hyperbolic n-manifold with non-empty geodesic boundary. Then $\|\overline{M}\| \neq 0$ and*

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M)}{\|\overline{M}\|} < v_n.$$

In this paper we show how to control the gap between $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|\overline{M}\|$ and v_n in terms of the ratio between the $(n-1)$-dimensional volume of ∂M and the n-dimensional volume of M. More precisely, in Section 4 we prove the following:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\eta > 0$. Then there exists $k > 0$ depending only on η and n such that the following result holds: if M is a hyperbolic n-manifold with non-empty geodesic boundary such that*

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(\partial M)}{\mathrm{Vol}(M)} \leq k,$$

then

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M)}{\|\overline{M}\|} \geq v_n - \eta.$$

It is not difficult to show that for every $n \geq 3$ there exist compact hyperbolic n-manifolds with non-empty disconnected geodesic boundary (see for example [GPS88, Example 2.8.C]). Let M be one such manifold, choose one connected component B_0 of ∂M and let M' be the manifold obtained by mirroring M along $\partial M \setminus B_0$, so $\partial M'$ is isometric to two copies of B_0. For $i \geq 1$, we inductively construct M_i by setting $M_1 = M'$ and defining M_{i+1} as the manifold obtained by isometrically gluing one component of ∂M_i to one component of ∂M_1. It is readily seen that M_i is a compact hyperbolic n-manifold with non-empty geodesic boundary such that $\mathrm{Vol}(M_i) = 2i\mathrm{Vol}(M)$ and $\mathrm{Vol}(\partial M_i) = 2\mathrm{Vol}(B_0)$. We have therefore

$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{Vol}(\partial M_i)/\mathrm{Vol}(M_i) = 0$. Together with our main theorem, this readily implies the following:

Corollary 1.5. *For every $\eta > 0$, a compact hyperbolic n-manifold M with non-empty geodesic boundary exists such that*

$$v_n > \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M)}{\|\overline{M}\|} \geq v_n - \eta.$$

Finally, it is maybe worth mentioning that our proof of Theorem 1.4 can be applied word by word (with obvious simplifications) to hyperbolic manifolds *without* boundary, thus providing a somewhat new proof of Theorem 1.2 in the case of non-compact manifolds.

1.3. **Strategy of the proof.** Let M be a hyperbolic n-manifold with possibly empty geodesic boundary. Once a *straightening* procedure is defined which allows to compute the simplicial volume of M only considering linear combinations of geodesic simplices, the inequality $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|\overline{M}\| \leq v_n$ is easily established. In the case without boundary, in order to prove the converse inequality (which fails in the case with boundary), one has to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ a cycle $\alpha_\varepsilon \in C_n(\overline{M}, \partial\overline{M})$ exists which represents the fundamental class of $\overline{M}$ and is such that $\|\alpha\| \leq \mathrm{Vol}(M)/v_n + \varepsilon$. Such a cycle is said to be *ε-efficient*, and it is not difficult to show that a cycle is ε-efficient if its simplices all have hyperbolic volume close to v_n (see *e.g.* [BP92]).

In the same spirit we prove here that if M has non-empty geodesic boundary then the gap between $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/\|\overline{M}\|$ and v_n is bounded from above by the amount of simplices in any fundamental cycle of $\overline{M}$ whose volume is forced to be far from v_n. In order to obtain Theorem 1.4 we then show how to control such amount of simplices in terms of the ratio between the $(n-1)$-dimensional volume of ∂M and the n-dimensional volume of M.

More precisely, in Section 2 we briefly describe some results about the geometry of hyperbolic manifolds with geodesic boundary. Section 3, which uses tools from [LS09, Section 4], is devoted to the description of a discrete version of Thurston's smearing construction which is very useful for exhibiting efficient cycles. Finally in Section 4 we provide the needed estimates on the norm of such cycles thus concluding the proof of Theorem 1.4.

2. Hyperbolic manifolds with geodesic boundary

Let $n \geq 3$ and let M be a hyperbolic n-manifold with *non-empty* geodesic boundary. This section is devoted to a brief description of the geometry of M.

2.1. **Natural compactification.** Since ∂M is compact, M decomposes as the union of a compact smooth manifold with boundary $N \subseteq M$ with $\partial M \subseteq N$ and a finite number of cusps of the form $T_i \times [0, \infty)$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, where T_i is a closed Euclidean $(n-1)$-manifold for every i (see *e.g.* [Koj90, Koj94, Fri06], where also the non-compact boundary case is considered). Moreover, N can be chosen in such a way that each cusp $T_i \times [0, \infty)$ is isometric to the quotient of a closed horoball in $\mathbb{H}^n$ by a parabolic group of isometries.

Up to choosing "deeper" cusps, given $\varepsilon > 0$ we may suppose that the volume of $M \setminus N$ is at most ε, and if this is the case we denote N by the symbol M_ε. We also denote by ∂M_ε the boundary of M_ε as a topological manifold and we set $\mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon) = M_\varepsilon \setminus \partial M_\varepsilon$. Observe that ∂M_ε is given by the union of ∂M and the boundaries of the deleted cusps.

The description of M just given implies that there exists a well-defined piecewise smooth nearest point retraction $M \to M_\varepsilon$ which maps $M \setminus \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)$ onto ∂M_ε. Moreover, M admits a natural compactification $\overline{M}$ which is obtained by adding a closed Euclidean $(n-1)$-manifold for each cusp and is homeomorphic to M_ε.

2.2. **Universal covering.** Let $\pi : \widetilde{M} \to M$ be the universal covering of M. By developing $\widetilde{M}$ in $\mathbb{H}^n$ we can identify $\widetilde{M}$ with a convex polyhedron of $\mathbb{H}^n$ bounded by a countable number of disjoint geodesic hyperplanes. The group of the automorphisms of the covering $\pi : \widetilde{M} \to M$ can be identified in a natural way with a discrete torsion-free subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{Isom}^+(\widetilde{M}) < \mathrm{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^n)$ such that $M \cong \widetilde{M}/\Gamma$. Also recall that there exists an isomorphism $\pi_1(M) \cong \Gamma$, which is canonical up to conjugacy. With a slight abuse, from now on we refer to Γ as to the fundamental group of M.

The covering $\pi \colon \widetilde{M} \to M$ extends to a covering $\mathbb{H}^n \to \mathbb{H}^n/\Gamma = \widehat{M}$, which will still be denoted by π. Being the quotient of $\mathbb{H}^n$ by a discrete torsion-free group of isometries, $\widehat{M}$ is a complete (infinite volume) hyperbolic manifold without boundary. The inclusion $\widetilde{M} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{H}^n$ induces an isometric inclusion $M \hookrightarrow \widehat{M}$ which realizes M as the *convex core* of $\widehat{M}$ (see *e.g.* [Fri06]). Therefore, there exists a well-defined piecewise smooth nearest point retraction of $\widehat{M}$ onto M, which maps $\widehat{M} \setminus \mathrm{int}(M)$ onto ∂M.

Let $\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon) = \widehat{M} \setminus \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)$. If ε is sufficiently small, by composing the retractions $\widehat{M} \to M$, $M \to M_\varepsilon$ mentioned above we get a retraction $p \colon \widehat{M} \to M_\varepsilon$ such that $p(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)) \subseteq \partial M_\varepsilon$. Such a map is piecewise smooth and induces a homotopy equivalence of pairs $p \colon (\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)) \to (M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon)$.

Since M retracts to M_ε via a homotopy equivalence, the set $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon} = \pi^{-1}(M_\varepsilon) \subseteq \widetilde{M}$ is simply connected, and provides therefore the Riemannian universal covering of M_ε. If $\mathrm{ext}(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}) = \mathbb{H}^n \setminus \widetilde{M_\varepsilon}$, then by construction $\mathrm{ext}(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})$ is a Γ-invariant disjoint union of closed half-spaces and closed horoballs. In particular, every component of $\mathrm{ext}(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})$ is convex.

3. Straightening and smearing

Introduced by Thurston in [Thu79], the smearing construction plays a fundamental rôle in several proofs of Theorem 1.2 (see *e.g.* [Thu79, Kue07]). Such a construction takes usually place in the setting of the so-called *measure homology* [Thu79, Zas98, Löh06]. In order to make the proof of Theorem 1.4 as self-contained as possible and to get rid of some technicalities, we follow here some ideas described in [LS09], where a "discrete version" of the smearing construction is introduced.

3.1. **Straight simplices.** We now fix some notations we will be extensively using from now on. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by e_i the point $(0,0,\dots,1,\dots,0,0,\dots) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ where the unique non-zero coefficient is at the i-th entry (entries are indexed by $\mathbb{N}$, so $(1,0,\dots) = e_0$). We denote by Δ_p the standard p-simplex, *i.e.* the convex hull of $e_0,\dots,e_p$, and we observe that with these notations we have $\Delta_p \subseteq \Delta_{p+1}$. If $\sigma \in S_p(X)$ is a singular simplex, we let $\partial_i \sigma \in S_{p-1}(X)$ be the i-th face of σ.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $x_0,\dots,x_k$ be points in $\mathbb{H}^n$. We recall here the well-known definition of *straight* simplex $[x_0,\dots,x_k] \in S_k(\mathbb{H}^n)$ with vertices $x_0,\dots,x_k$: if $k=0$, then $[x_0]$ is the 0-simplex with image x_0; if straight simplices have been defined for every $h \leq k$, then $[x_0,\dots,x_{k+1}]\colon \Delta_{k+1} \to \mathbb{H}^n$ is determined by the following condition: for every $z \in \Delta_k \subseteq \Delta_{k+1}$, the restriction of $[x_0,\dots,x_{k+1}]$ to the segment with endpoints z, e_{k+1} is a constant speed parameterization of the geodesic joining $[x_0,\dots,x_k](z)$ to x_{k+1} (the fact that $[x_0,\dots,x_{k+1}]$ is well-defined and continuous is an obvious consequence of the fact that any two given points in $\mathbb{H}^n$ are joined by a unique geodesic, and hyperbolic geodesics continuously depend on their endpoints). It is not difficult to show that the image of a straight k-simplex coincides with the hyperbolic convex hull of its vertices, and is therefore a (possibly degenerate) geodesic k-simplex.

Keeping notations from Subsections 2.1, 2.2, if $\widehat{M}$ is a hyperbolic n-manifold with universal covering $\pi\colon \mathbb{H}^n \to \widehat{M}$ then we say that $\sigma\colon \Delta_k \to \widehat{M}$ is *straight* if it is obtained by composing a straight simplex in $\mathbb{H}^n$ with the covering projection π.

The results stated in the following remarks will not be used in this paper.

Remark 3.1. Let $\sigma \in S_k(\widehat{M})$, take a lift $\widetilde{\sigma} \in S_k(\mathbb{H}^n)$ and define $\mathrm{str}_k(\sigma) = \pi \circ [\widetilde{\sigma}(e_0),\dots,\widetilde{\sigma}(e_k)]$. Since isometries preserve geodesics we have $\gamma \circ [x_0,\dots,x_k] = [\gamma(x_0),\dots,\gamma(x_k)]$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$, so $\mathrm{str}_k(\sigma)$ does not depend on the choice of $\widetilde{\sigma}$. It is well-known that str_* linearly extends to a chain endomorphism of $C_*(\widehat{M})$ which is algebraically homotopic to the identity.

Remark 3.2. Straight simplices may be defined in the much more general setting of non-positively curved complete Riemannian manifolds. Almost all the properties of straight simplices (and of the associated straightening procedure) described above also hold in this wider context. It is maybe worth mentioning, however, that in the simply connected non-constant curvature case, straight simplices need not be convex.

3.2. **Haar measure.** Let G be a locally compact Hausdorff topological group and $\mathcal{A}$ be the σ-algebra of the Borelian subsets of G. A measure μ on $\mathcal{A}$ is called *regular* if for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A) &= \sup\{\mu(K) \mid K \text{ compact set, } K \subset A\} \\ \mu(A) &= \inf\{\mu(U) \mid U \text{ open set, } A \subset U\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.3. A *Haar measure* μ_G on G is a non-negative regular measure μ_G on the σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ such that:

- $\mu_G(K) < \infty$ for each compact set $K \in \mathcal{A}$;
- $\mu_G(A) \neq 0$ for each non-empty open set $A \in \mathcal{A}$;
- $\mu_G(gA) = \mu_G(A)$ $\forall g \in G$ and $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}$, namely the measure is left invariant.

It is well-known that every locally compact Hausdorff group admits a Haar measure, which is unique up to multiplication by a positive costant [Joh76, Wei65]. The group G is called *unimodular* if each left invariant Haar measure on it is also right invariant.

From now on we denote by G the group $\mathrm{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^n)$ of orientation-preserving isometries of $\mathbb{H}^n$, endowed with the compact-open topology.

Proposition 3.4 ([BP92, Rat94])**.** *The group G is locally compact and unimodular. Moreover, the Haar measure μ_G on G can be normalized in such a way that the following condition holds: for every basepoint $x \in \mathbb{H}^n$ and every Borelian set $R \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$, if*

$$S = \{g \in G \,|\, g(x) \in R\}$$

then S is Borelian and $\mu_G(S)$ is equal to the hyperbolic volume of R.

From now on we fix a Haar measure μ_G on G satisfying the normalization condition described in Proposition 3.4. Keeping notations from the preceding section, Γ acts properly discontinuously on G via left translations as a group of measure-preserving diffeomorphisms, so if W is a Borelian subset of $\Gamma\backslash G$ we can set

$$\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(W) = \mu_G(\widetilde{W}),$$

where $\widetilde{W} \subseteq G$ is any Borelian set that projects bijectively onto W. It is readily seen that this definition of $\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(W)$ does not depend on the choice of $\widetilde{W}$, and that $\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}$ is in fact a regular *right-invariant* measure on $\Gamma\backslash G$. The following lemma will prove useful later:

Lemma 3.5. *Let $A \subseteq \widehat{M}$ be a Borelian subset, fix a basepoint $x \in \mathbb{H}^n$ and let*

$$T = \{g \in G \,|\, \pi(g(x)) \in A\}.$$

Then T is a Borelian subset of G such that $\gamma \cdot T = T$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Gamma\backslash T) = \mathrm{Vol}(A)$, where Vol *denotes the measure induced by the hyperbolic volume form of $\widehat{M}$.*

Proof. Since the map $f_x\colon G \to \widehat{M}$ defined by $f_x(g) = \pi(g(x))$ is continuous, if A is Borelian then $T = f_x^{-1}(A)$ is Borelian and Γ-invariant. Moreover, if $D \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$ is a Borelian set of representatives for the action of Γ on $\mathbb{H}^n$, then the set $T' = \{g \in G \,|\, g(x) \in D \cap \pi^{-1}(A)\}$ is a Borelian set of representatives for the left action of Γ on T. We have therefore $\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Gamma\backslash T) = \mu_G(T')$. On the other hand the restriction $\pi|_D\colon D \to \widehat{M}$ is measure-preserving, so $\mathrm{Vol}(A) = \mathrm{Vol}(D \cap \pi^{-1}(A)) = \mu_G(T')$, where the last equality is due to the chosen normalization of μ_G. □

3.3. **Γ-nets.** In order to define a "discrete" smearing procedure in the spirit of [LS09] we now need to introduce the notion of Γ-net. A Γ-*net* in $\mathbb{H}^n$ is given by a discrete subset $\widetilde{\Lambda} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$ (called set of *vertices*) and a collection of Borelian sets $\{\widetilde{B}_x\}_{x\in\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ (called *cells*) such that the following conditions hold:

(1) $x \in \widetilde{B}_x$ for every $x \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$, $\mathbb{H}^n = \bigcup_{x\in\widetilde{\Lambda}} \widetilde{B}_x$ and $\widetilde{B}_x \cap \widetilde{B}_y = \emptyset$ for every $x, y \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$ with $x \neq y$;
(2) $\gamma(\widetilde{\Lambda}) = \widetilde{\Lambda}$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\gamma(\widetilde{B}_x) = \widetilde{B}_{\gamma(x)}$ for every $x \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$;
(3) $\mathrm{diam}\,(\widetilde{B}_x) \leq 1$ for every $x \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$;
(4) if $\widetilde{K}$ is a connected component of $\mathrm{ext}(\widetilde{M}_\varepsilon)$, then $\widetilde{K} \subseteq \bigcup_{x\in\widetilde{\Lambda}\cap\widetilde{K}} \widetilde{B}_x$.

We begin with the following:

Lemma 3.6. *There exists a Γ-net.*

Proof. Let $\{T_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a smooth triangulation of $\widehat{M}$ which restricts to a smooth triangulation of M_ε and is such that $\mathrm{diam}(T_i) \leq 1/2$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since M_ε is compact, the set of simplices of the triangulation whose internal part is contained in M_ε is finite, so we may assume that indices are ordered in such a way that $i < j$ for every pair of simplices such that $\mathrm{int}(T_i) \subseteq M_\varepsilon$ and $\mathrm{int}(T_j) \nsubseteq M_\varepsilon$.

If x_i is any point in $\mathrm{int}(T_i)$ we now set $\Lambda = \{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $B_{x_i} = T_i \setminus (\bigcup_{j>i} T_j)$. By contruction B_{x_i} is a simply connected Borelian subset of $\widehat{M}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and if K is a connected component of $\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)$, then $K = \bigcup_{x\in\Lambda\cap K} B_x$.

Let now $\widetilde{\Lambda} = \pi^{-1}(\Lambda)$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, since B_{x_i} is simply connected every point $\widetilde{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x_i)$ is contained in exactly one connected component $\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{x}}$ of $\pi^{-1}(B_{x_i}) \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$.

It is now readily seen that the pair $\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}, \{\widetilde{B}_x\}_{x\in\widetilde{\Lambda}}\right)$ is a Γ-net. □

3.4. **Smearing.** Let now $L > 0$ be fixed, and let $q_0^+, \ldots q_n^+ \in \mathbb{H}^n$ be the vertices of a fixed regular simplex with edgelength L such that the embedding $\tau_L^+ = [q_0^+, \ldots, q_n^+]$ of the standard simplex in $\mathbb{H}^n$ is orientation-preserving. We also fix an orientation-reversing isometry g_- of $\mathbb{H}^n$ and set $q_i^- = g_-(q_i)$, $\tau_L^- = [q_0^-, \ldots, q_n^-] = g_- \circ \tau_L^+$.

Let us fix a Γ-net $\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}, \{\widetilde{B}_x\}_{x\in\widetilde{\Lambda}}\right)$ and let $S_n^\Lambda(\widehat{M})$ be the set of straight simplices in $\widehat{M}$ with vertices in $\Lambda = \pi(\widetilde{\Lambda})$. We would like to define real coefficients a_σ in such a way that the sum

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_n^\Lambda(\widehat{M})} a_\sigma \sigma$$

is finite and defines a cycle in $C_n(\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$. Roughly speaking, the coefficient a_σ will measure the difference between the accuracy with which σ approximates an isometric copy of τ_L^+ and the accuracy with which it approximates an isometric copy of τ_L^-.

So let us fix $\sigma \in S_n^\Lambda(\widehat{M})$, let $\widetilde{\sigma}$ be a lift of σ to $\mathbb{H}^n$ and let $\widetilde{x}_{i_0}, \ldots, \widetilde{x}_{i_n}$ be the vertices of $\widetilde{\sigma}$. Since $\sigma \in S_n^\Lambda$ we have $\widetilde{x}_{i_j} \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$ for every j, and we denote by $\widetilde{B}_{i_j}$ the cell of the net containing $\widetilde{x}_{i_j}$. Since different lifts of σ differ by the action of an element of Γ it is easily seen that the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\sigma^+ &= \{[g] \in \Gamma \backslash G \,|\, g(q_j^+) \in \widetilde{B}_{i_j} \text{ for every } j\}, \\ \Omega_\sigma^- &= \{[g] \in \Gamma \backslash G \,|\, g(q_j^-) \in \widetilde{B}_{i_j} \text{ for every } j\} \end{aligned}$$

are well-defined (*i.e.* do not depend on the chosen lift $\widetilde{\sigma}$) and Borelian.

We now divide the simplices of $S_n^\Lambda(\widehat{M})$ into different classes. We denote by W^+ (resp. W^-) the set of simplices which intersect $\mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)$ and are "almost isometric" to τ_L^+ (resp. τ_L^-):

$$\begin{aligned} W^+ &= \{\sigma \in S_n^\Lambda(\widehat{M}) \,|\, \mathrm{Im}\,(\sigma) \cap \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \Omega_\sigma^+ \neq \emptyset\}, \\ W^- &= \{\sigma \in S_n^\Lambda(\widehat{M}) \,|\, \mathrm{Im}\,(\sigma) \cap \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \Omega_\sigma^- \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we denote by $W_{\mathrm{int}}^\pm$ the subset of $W^\pm$ given by those simplices whose image is entirely contained in $\mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)$:

$$W_{\mathrm{int}}^+ = \{\sigma \in W^+ \,|\, \mathrm{Im}\,(\sigma) \subseteq \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)\}, \quad W_{\mathrm{int}}^- = \{\sigma \in W^- \,|\, \mathrm{Im}\,(\sigma) \subseteq \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)\},$$

and we finally set

$$W = W^+ \cup W^-, \quad W_{\mathrm{int}} = W_{\mathrm{int}}^+ \cup W_{\mathrm{int}}^-, \quad W_{\mathrm{ext}} = W \setminus W_{\mathrm{int}}.$$

For every $\sigma \in W$ we now set

$$b_\sigma^+ = \mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Omega_\sigma^+), \quad b_\sigma^- = \mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Omega_\sigma^-), \quad a_\sigma = \frac{b_\sigma^+ - b_\sigma^-}{2}.$$

We will prove soon that W is finite and that each a_σ is a well-defined real number (see Lemma 3.8). Moreover, we will show in Proposition 3.9 that the sum $\sum_{\sigma \in W} a_\sigma \sigma$ defines a relative cycle in $C_n(\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$, which defines in turn a cycle in $C_n(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon)$ via a projection which does not affect simplices supported in $\mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)$. Therefore if L is large and "most" simplices of W are contained in $\mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon)$, then a fundamental cycle for M_ε exists most simplices of which have volume close to v_n. As explained in Subsection 1.3, this is sufficient for proving that the simplicial volume of M_ε (whence of $\overline{M}$) is close to $\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)/v_n$ (whence to $\mathrm{Vol}(M)/v_n$).

Lemma 3.7. *If* $\widetilde{\sigma} \in S_n(\mathbb{H}^n)$ *is a lift of a simplex* $\sigma \in W$*, then* $\mathrm{diam}(\mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma})) \leq L + 2$.

Proof. The edges of $\tau_L^\pm$ have length L, and if $\sigma \in W$ then the vertices of $\widetilde{\sigma}$ are at distance at most 1 from the vertices of an isometric copy of $\tau_L^\pm$. This implies that the distance between any two vertices of $\widetilde{\sigma}$ is at most $L+2$. But $\widetilde{\sigma}$ is the convex hull of its vertices and the hyperbolic distance is convex, so the diameter of $\widetilde{\sigma}$ is realized by the distance between two vertices. □

We now fix some notations: for $Y \subseteq \widehat{M}$ (resp. $Y \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$) and $R \geq 0$ we denote by $N_R(Y)$ the *closed* R-neighbourhood of Y in $\widehat{M}$ (resp. in $\mathbb{H}^n$).

Lemma 3.8. *The set* W *is finite and*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)) & \leq & \sum_{\sigma\in W^+_{\mathrm{int}}} b^+_\sigma & \leq & \sum_{\sigma\in W^+} b^+_\sigma & \leq & \mathrm{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)),\\ \mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)) & \leq & \sum_{\sigma\in W^-_{\mathrm{int}}} b^-_\sigma & \leq & \sum_{\sigma\in W^-} b^-_\sigma & \leq & \mathrm{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)).\end{array}$$

Proof. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$ be a compact fundamental region for the action of Γ on $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}$. If $\sigma \in W$ there exists a lift $\widetilde{\sigma} \in S_n(\mathbb{H}^n)$ of σ such that $\mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma}) \cap D \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.7 the diameter $\widetilde{\sigma}$ is at most $L+2$, so $\mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma}) \subseteq N_{L+2}(D)$. However, $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ is discrete and $N_{L+2}(D)$ is compact, so the number of straight simplices in $\mathbb{H}^n$ which are contained in $N_{L+2}(D)$ and have vertices in $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ is finite. Since every $\sigma \in W$ is obtained by composing such a simplex with the covering projection π we get that also W is finite.

We now prove the first sequence of inequalities of the statement, the proof of the second one being very similar. We define subsets of hyperbolic isometries $H_L^+, K_L^+ \subseteq G$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} K_L^+ & = & \{g \in G \,|\, g(q_0^+) \in \widetilde{M_\varepsilon} \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})\},\\ H_L^+ & = & \{g \in G \,|\, g(q_0^+) \in N_L(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})\}.\end{array}$$

By Lemma 3.5 such sets are Γ-invariant Borelian subsets of G such that

$$\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Gamma\backslash K_L^+) = \mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)), \qquad \mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Gamma\backslash H_L^+) = \mathrm{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)). \tag{1}$$

We now show that the following inclusions hold:

$$\Gamma\backslash K_L^+ \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma\in W^+_{\mathrm{int}}} \Omega^+_\sigma \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma\in W^+} \Omega^+_\sigma \subseteq \Gamma\backslash H_L^+. \tag{2}$$

Suppose in fact that $g \in K_L^+$. Then $g(q_0^+)$ lies in $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon} \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})$, so if $y_i \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$ is the vertex of the cell containing $g(q_i^+)$, then y_0 lies in $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon} \setminus N_{L+2}(\partial\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})$. Let now $\widetilde{\sigma}$ be the straight simplex with vertices $y_0, \ldots, y_n$ and set $\sigma = \pi \circ \widetilde{\sigma}$. By Lemma 3.7 the image of $\widetilde{\sigma}$ lies in $\mathrm{int}(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})$. Since by construction $[g] \in \Omega^+_\sigma \neq \emptyset$, this implies $\sigma \in W^+_{\mathrm{int}}$. We have thus proved that $\Gamma\backslash K_L^+ \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma\in W^+_{\mathrm{int}}} \Omega^+_\sigma$.

On the other hand suppose $[g] \in \Omega^+_\sigma$ for some $\sigma \in W^+$. Then there exists a lift $\widetilde{\sigma}$ of σ with vertices $y_0, \ldots, y_n \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$ such that $\mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma}) \cap \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ and $g(q_i^+) \in \widetilde{B}_{y_i}$ for every $i = 0, \ldots, n$. Suppose by contradiction $g(q_0^+) \notin N_L(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon})$. Having diameter L and being connected, the image of $g \circ \tau_L^+$ is then contained in a component $\widetilde{K}$

of $\mathrm{ext}(\widetilde{M}_\varepsilon)$. Since $g(q_i^+) \in \widetilde{B}_{y_i}$, by property (4) in the definition of Γ-net we have therefore $y_i \in \widetilde{K}$ for every i, so $\mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma}) \subseteq \widetilde{K}$ by convexity of $\widetilde{K}$, a contradiction. We have thus proved that $\bigcup_{\sigma\in W^+} \Omega_\sigma^+ \subseteq \Gamma\backslash H_L^+$.

Since the Ω_σ^+'s are mutually disjoint, condition (2) now implies

$$\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Gamma\backslash K_L^+) \leq \sum_{\sigma\in W^+_{\mathrm{int}}} \mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Omega_\sigma^+) \leq \sum_{\sigma\in W^+} \mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Omega_\sigma^+) \leq \mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}(\Gamma\backslash H_L^+).$$

By equations (1) and the very definition of the b_σ^+'s, these inequalities are in fact equivalent to the first sequence of inequalities in the statement. □

We now set

$$\zeta_{L,\varepsilon} = \sum_{\sigma\in W} a_\sigma \sigma \in C_n(\widehat{M}).$$

Proposition 3.9. *We have $d\zeta_{L,\varepsilon} \in C_{n-1}(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$, so $\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}$ is a relative n-cycle in $C_*(\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$.*

Proof. Fix a $(n-1)$-face $\nu \in S_{n-1}(\widehat{M})$ of some $\sigma \in W$. We will show that if $\mathrm{Im}(\nu) \cap \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$, then the coefficient of ν in $d\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}$ is null. For every $j = 0, \dots, n$ let us set $\theta_j^\pm(\nu) = \{\sigma \in W^\pm \,|\, \partial_j\sigma = \nu\}$ and $\theta_j(\nu) = \theta_j^+(\nu) \cup \theta_j^-(\nu)$. Since the coefficient of ν in $d\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}$ is given by

$$\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\theta_j(\nu)} a_\sigma \right),$$

it is sufficient to prove that under the assumption $\mathrm{Im}(\nu) \cap \mathrm{int}(M_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ we have

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\theta_j^+(\nu)} b_\sigma^+ = \sum_{\sigma\in\theta_j^-(\nu)} b_\sigma^-$$

for every $j = 0, \dots, n$.

Let us suppose $j = n$, the other cases being similar. Let $\widetilde{\nu}$ be a fixed lift of ν to $\mathbb{H}^n$, and for every $\sigma \in \theta_n(\nu)$ let us denote by $\widetilde{\sigma}$ the unique lift of σ such that $\partial_n\widetilde{\sigma} = \widetilde{\nu}$. By construction we have $\widetilde{\nu}(e_i) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$ for every $i = 0, \dots, n-1$, and we denote by $\widetilde{B}_i$ the cell $\widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{\nu}(e_i)}$ containing $\widetilde{\nu}(e_i)$. Now if $\sigma \in \theta_n(\nu)$ then $\widetilde{\sigma}(e_n)$ belongs to $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\sigma}(e_i) = \widetilde{\tau}(e_i)$ for every $i = 0, \dots, n-1$. Therefore if

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_\sigma^\pm = \left\{ g \in G \,|\, g(q_i^\pm) \in \widetilde{B}_i \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, n-1,\ g(q_n^\pm) \in \widetilde{B}_{\widetilde{\sigma}(e_n)} \right\}$$

we have that $\widetilde{\Omega}_\sigma^\pm$ is Borelian and bijectively projects onto $\Omega_\sigma^\pm \subseteq \Gamma\backslash G$, so that $b_\sigma^\pm = \mu_G\left(\widetilde{\Omega}_\sigma^\pm\right)$. Let now

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_\nu^\pm = \{ g \in G \,|\, g(q_i^\pm) \in \widetilde{B}_i \text{ for every } i = 0, \dots, n-1 \}.$$

We claim that $\widetilde{\Omega}^\pm_\nu = \bigcup_{\sigma\in\theta^\pm_n(\nu)} \widetilde{\Omega}^\pm_\sigma$. The inclusion $\supseteq$ is obvious, while in order to get the inclusion $\subseteq$ it is sufficient to observe that if $g \in \widetilde{\Omega}^\pm_\nu$ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$ is the straight simplex with vertices in the cells containing $g(q_0^\pm),\ldots,g(q_n^\pm)$, then necessarily $\mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{\sigma})\cap \mathrm{int}(\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}) \neq \emptyset$, so that $\sigma = \pi\circ\widetilde{\sigma}$ belongs to $\theta^\pm_n(\nu)$ and g belongs to $\widetilde{\Omega}^\pm_\sigma$.

Since the $\widetilde{\Omega}^+_\sigma$'s (resp. the $\widetilde{\Omega}^-_\sigma$'s) are pairwise disjoint we finally get

$$\begin{array}{lllllll}\sum_{\sigma\in\theta^+_n(\nu)} b^+_\sigma & = & \sum_{\sigma\in\theta^+_n(\nu)} \mu_G\left(\widetilde{\Omega}^+_\sigma\right) & = & \mu_G\left(\bigcup_{\sigma\in\theta^+_n(\nu)} \widetilde{\Omega}^+_\sigma\right) & = & \mu_G(\widetilde{\Omega}^+_\nu),\\ \sum_{\sigma\in\theta^-_n(\nu)} b^-_\sigma & = & \sum_{\sigma\in\theta^-_n(\nu)} \mu_G\left(\widetilde{\Omega}^-_\sigma\right) & = & \mu_G\left(\bigcup_{\sigma\in\theta^-_n(\nu)} \widetilde{\Omega}^-_\sigma\right) & = & \mu_G(\widetilde{\Omega}^-_\nu),\end{array}$$

so in order to conclude we are left to show that $\mu_G(\widetilde{\Omega}^+_\nu) = \mu_G(\widetilde{\Omega}^-_\nu)$. Recall now that a orientation-reversing isometry $g_-\in \mathrm{Isom}^-(\mathbb{H}^n)$ exists such that $g_-(q_i^+) = q_i^-$ for every $i = 0,\ldots,n$ and let $s_n \in \mathrm{Isom}^-(\mathbb{H}^n)$ be the reflection along the face of τ_L^- opposite to q_n^-. It is readily seen that $g\in\widetilde{\Omega}^-_\nu$ if and only if $gs_ng_- \in \widetilde{\Omega}^+_\nu$, so $\widetilde{\Omega}^+_\nu = \widetilde{\Omega}^-_\nu\cdot(s_ng_-)$. Now the conclusion follows from the fact that $s_n\circ g_-\in G$ and μ_G is right-invariant. ☐

Let now $p_*\colon C_n(\widehat{M},\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)) \to C_n(M_\varepsilon,\partial M_\varepsilon)$ be the map induced by the piecewise smooth retraction $p\colon(\widehat{M},\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))\to(M_\varepsilon,\partial M_\varepsilon)$ described in Subsection 2.2. The cycle

$$\xi_{L,\varepsilon} = p_*(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})$$

is our "efficient cycle": in order to prove Theorem 1.4, in the next section we estimate both the L^1-norm of $\xi_{L,\varepsilon}$ and the proportionality factor between the class of $\xi_{L,\varepsilon}$ in $H_n(M_\varepsilon,\partial M_\varepsilon)$ and the fundamental class $[M_\varepsilon]$ of M_ε.

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

We begin by estimating the L^1-norm of $\xi_{L,\varepsilon}$.

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$\|\xi_{L,\varepsilon}\| \le \mathrm{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)).$$

Proof. Since $p_*\colon C_n(\widehat{M},\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)) \to C_n(M_\varepsilon,\partial M_\varepsilon)$ is norm non-increasing we have

$$2\|\xi_{L,\varepsilon}\| \le 2\|\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}\| = \sum_{\sigma\in W}\left|b^+_\sigma - b^-_\sigma\right| \le \sum_{\sigma\in W^+} b^+_\sigma + \sum_{\sigma\in W^-} b^-_\sigma \le 2\mathrm{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)),$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 3.8. ☐

4.1. **The volume form.** In order to compute the proportionality factor between $[\xi_{L,\varepsilon}]$ and $[M_\varepsilon]$ we would like to evaluate the Kronecker product of $[\xi_{L,\varepsilon}]$ with the volume coclass of M_ε. As usual, we first have to take care of the fact that differential forms can be integrated only on smooth simplices. So let $S^s_k(\widehat{M})$ (resp. $S^s_k(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$) be the set of *smooth* simplices with values in $\widehat{M}$ (resp. in $\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)$), let $C^s_k(\widehat{M})$ (resp. $C^s_k(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$) be the free $\mathbb{R}$-module generated by $S^s_k(\widehat{M})$ (resp. by $S^s_k(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$) and let us set $C^s_k(\widehat{M},\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)) = C^s_k(\widehat{M})/C^s_k(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$. A standard result of differential topology (see *e.g.* [Lee03]) ensures that a chain map $\mathrm{sm}_*\colon C_*(\widehat{M}) \to C^s_*(\widehat{M})$ exists such that:

1. $\mathrm{sm}_k(\sigma) \in S^s_k(\widehat{M})$ for every $\sigma \in S_k(\widehat{M})$ and $\mathrm{sm}_k(\sigma) \in S^s_k(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$ for every $\sigma \in S_k(\mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$;
2. sm_* restricts to the identity of $C^s_*(M_\varepsilon)$;
3. if $j_*\colon C^s_*(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon) \to C_*(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon)$ is induced by the natural inclusion, then sm_* induces a map $C_*(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon) \to C^s_*(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon)$, which will still be denoted by sm_*, such that $j_* \circ \mathrm{sm}_*$ is homotopic to the identity of $C_*(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon)$.

We fix an orientation on $\widehat{M}$ (whence on M_ε) by requiring that the fixed covering $\pi\colon \mathbb{H}^n \to \widehat{M}$ is orientation-preserving, and we denote by ω the volume differential form on $\widehat{M}$. Since the retraction $p\colon \widehat{M} \to M_\varepsilon$ defined in Subsection 2.2 is piecewise smooth, for every $\sigma \in S_n(\widehat{M})$ it makes sense to integrate ω over the composition of $\mathrm{sm}_n(\sigma)$ with p. We then define $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}\colon C_n(\widehat{M}) \to \mathbb{R}$ as the linear extension of the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_n(\widehat{M}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \\ \sigma & \longmapsto & \int_{p\circ \mathrm{sm}_n(\sigma)} \omega. \end{array}$$

By property (1) of the smoothing operator, if $\mathrm{Im}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)$ then $\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{sm}_n(\sigma)) \subseteq \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)$, so $\mathrm{Im}(p \circ \mathrm{sm}_n(\sigma)) \subseteq \partial M_\varepsilon$ and $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\sigma) = 0$. Moreover, since sm_* is a chain map, if $c \in C_n(\widehat{M})$ is a boundary then $\mathrm{sm}_n(c)$ is the boundary of a smooth $(n+1)$-chain, so $p_*(\mathrm{sm}_n(c))$ is the boundary of a piecewise smooth $(n+1)$-chain and as a consequence of Stokes' Theorem we have $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(c) = 0$. It follows that $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}$ is a cocycle, and defines therefore a cohomology class $[\Omega_{\widehat{M}}] \in H^n(\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$.

Recall now that for every topological pair (X, Y) there exists a well-defined pairing (usually called *Kronecker pairing*) given by

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\colon H^p(X,Y) \times H_p(X,Y) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \langle [\varphi], [c] \rangle = \varphi(c).$$

Let $\zeta_{L,\varepsilon} \in C_n(\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$ be the cycle constructed above such that $\xi_{L,\varepsilon} = p_*(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})$, and let $i\colon (M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon) \to (\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon))$ be the inclusion.

Lemma 4.2. *We have*

$$[\xi_{L,\varepsilon}] = \frac{\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})}{\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)} [M_\varepsilon].$$

Proof. We begin by recalling that

$$\left\langle \left[\Omega_{\widehat{M}}\right], i_*\left([M_\varepsilon]\right)\right\rangle = \mathrm{Vol}\left(M_\varepsilon\right).$$

In fact, if $\varphi\colon \Delta_n \to M_\varepsilon$ is a positively oriented smooth embedding, then by the very definitions we have that $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(i_*(\varphi))$ equals the hyperbolic volume of $\mathrm{Im}(\varphi)$. We may now represent the fundamental class $[M_\varepsilon] \in H_n(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon)$ by a finite sum of positively oriented embeddings $\varphi_i\colon \Delta_n \to T_i$, $i \in I$, where $\{T_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a finite smooth triangulation of M_ε. So

$$\left\langle \left[\Omega_{\widehat{M}}\right], i_*\left([M_\varepsilon]\right)\right\rangle = \Omega_{\widehat{M}}\left(i_*\left(\sum_{i\in I}\varphi_i\right)\right) = \sum_{i\in I}\mathrm{Vol}(T_i) = \mathrm{Vol}\left(M_\varepsilon\right).$$

Since $H_n(\widehat{M}, \mathrm{ext}(M_\varepsilon)) \cong H_n(M_\varepsilon, \partial M_\varepsilon) \cong \mathbb{R}$, this readily implies

$$[\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}] = \frac{\langle[\Omega_{\widehat{M}}], [\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}]\rangle}{\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)} \cdot i_*([M_\varepsilon]) = \frac{\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})}{\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)} \cdot i_*([M_\varepsilon]),$$

whence

$$[\xi_{L,\varepsilon}] = p_*([\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}]) = \frac{\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})}{\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)} p_*(i_*([M_\varepsilon])) = \frac{\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})}{\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)}[M_\varepsilon].$$

□

In order to estimate the proportionality coefficient between $[\xi_{L,\varepsilon}]$ and $[M_\varepsilon]$ we are therefore left to compute $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon})$.

Let $\tau_L^\pm \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$ be the regular n-simplex with edgelength L and vertices $q_0^\pm, \ldots, q_n^\pm$ introduced above. Let $R_L^\pm$ be the set of all straight n-simplices σ in $\mathbb{H}^n$ satisfying the following property: there exists $g \in \mathrm{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^n)$ such that the distance between $g(q_i^\pm)$ and the i-th vertex of σ is at most one for every $i = 0, \ldots, n$. Let

$$V_L = \inf\{\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in R_L^+\} = -\sup\{\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in R_L^-\},$$

where $\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{alg}}$ is the *signed* volume of σ, *i.e.* the value obtained by integrating ω on σ (so $|\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\sigma)| = \mathrm{Vol}(\mathrm{Im}(\sigma))$).

It is easily seen that $L_0 > 0$ exists such that for every element $\sigma \in R_L^+$ (resp. $\sigma \in R_L^-$) we have $\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\sigma) > 0$ (resp. $\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\sigma) < 0$). Moreover, the hyperbolic volume of a geodesic simplex with vertices on $\mathbb{H}^n \cup \partial\mathbb{H}^n$ is a continuous function of its vertices (see [Rat94, Theorem 11.3.2]). As a consequence we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} V_L = v_n. \tag{3}$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let $L \geq L_0$. Then*

$$\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{L,\varepsilon}) \geq V_L \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)).$$

Proof. With notations as in Subsection 3.4 we set

$$\zeta_{\text{int}}^+ = \sum_{\sigma\in W_{\text{int}}^+} b_\sigma^+\sigma, \quad \zeta_{\text{int}}^- = -\sum_{\sigma\in W_{\text{int}}^-} b_\sigma^-\sigma, \quad \zeta_{\text{ext}} = \sum_{\sigma\in W_{\text{ext}}} a_\sigma\sigma.$$

Take $\sigma \in W$. By the very definitions $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\sigma)$ is the signed volume of the portion of $\text{Im}(\sigma)$ contained in M_ε, so if $\sigma \in W_{\text{int}}^+$ (resp. $\sigma \in W_{\text{int}}^-$) we have

$$\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(b_\sigma^+\sigma) = b_\sigma^+\text{Vol}_{\text{alg}}(\sigma) \geq b_\sigma^+ \cdot V_L, \qquad \Omega_{\widehat{M}}(-b_\sigma^-\sigma) = -b_\sigma^-\text{Vol}_{\text{alg}}(\sigma) \geq b_\sigma^- \cdot V_L.$$

By Lemma 3.8 we now get

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{\text{int}}^+) & \geq & \left(\sum_{\sigma\in W_{\text{int}}^+} b_\sigma^+\right) V_L & \geq & \text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(M_\varepsilon)) \cdot V_L, \\ \Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{\text{int}}^-) & \geq & \left(\sum_{\sigma\in W_{\text{int}}^-} b_\sigma^-\right) V_L & \geq & \text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(M_\varepsilon)) \cdot V_L. \end{array} \tag{4}$$

Moreover, since $L \geq L_0$ if $b_\sigma^+ \neq 0$ then σ is positively oriented, while if $b_\sigma^- \neq 0$ then σ is negatively oriented. This easily implies that for every $\sigma \in W_{\text{ext}}$ we have $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(a_\sigma\sigma) \geq 0$, so $\Omega_{\widehat{M}}(\zeta_{\text{ext}}) \geq 0$. Together with inequalities (4) and the fact that $\zeta_{L,\varepsilon} = (\zeta_{\text{int}}^+ + \zeta_{\text{int}}^-)/2 + \zeta_{\text{ext}}$, this readily implies the conclusion. □

Corollary 4.4. *We have*

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(M)}{||\overline{M}||} \geq \frac{\text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon))}{\text{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon))} \cdot V_L \tag{5}$$

Proof. Since $\overline{M}$ is diffeomorphic to M_ε we have $\|\overline{M}\| = \|M_\varepsilon\| = \|[M_\varepsilon]\|$. Thus from Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.3 we get

$$||\overline{M}|| = \left\| \frac{\text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)}{\langle [\Omega_{\widehat{M}}], \xi_{L,\varepsilon}\rangle} [\xi_{L,\varepsilon}] \right\| \leq \left| \frac{\text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)}{\langle [\Omega_{\widehat{M}}], \xi_{L,\varepsilon}\rangle} \right| \|\xi_{L,\varepsilon}\| \leq \frac{\text{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)) \cdot \text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)}{V_L \cdot \text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon))}.$$

Since $\text{Vol}(M) \geq \text{Vol}(M_\varepsilon)$, this readily implies the conclusion. □

4.2. **The final step.** In order to conclude we now need some estimates on the volume of L-neighbourhoods of geodesic hypersurfaces in hyperbolic manifolds. For $t \geq 0$ let $g(t) = 2\int_0^L \cosh^{n-1}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$. An easy computation (see *e.g.* [Bas94]) shows that if A is an embedded totally geodesic hypersurface in a hyperbolic n-manifold X, then the n-dimensional volume of any embedded tubular t-neighbourhood of A in X is given by $g(t) \cdot \text{Vol}(A)$.

Lemma 4.5. *For every $L > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \text{Vol}(N_L(\partial M_\varepsilon)) \leq g(L) \cdot \text{Vol}(\partial M).$$

Proof. Recall that $\partial M_\varepsilon = \partial M \cup T_\varepsilon$, where T_ε is the union of the boundaries of the deleted cusps. Therefore $N_L(\partial M_\varepsilon) = N_L(\partial M) \cup N_L(T_\varepsilon)$ and it is easily seen that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \text{Vol}(N_L(T_\varepsilon)) = 0$ whence $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \text{Vol}(N_L(\partial M_\varepsilon)) = \text{Vol}(N_L(\partial M))$.

Let now B be a connected component of ∂M and let $X \to \widehat{M}$ be the Riemannian covering associated to the image of $\pi_1(B)$ into $\pi_1(M)$. Then X is diffeomorphic to $B \times (-\infty, +\infty)$ and contains a totally geodesic hypersurface $B \times \{0\}$ isometric to B. The L-neighbourhood of $B \times \{0\}$ in X is embedded and has therefore volume $g(L) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(B)$. Since the projection $X \to \widehat{M}$ is a local isometry and maps (possibly not injectively) such a neighbourhood onto $N_L(B) \subseteq \widehat{M}$, it follows that $\mathrm{Vol}(N_L(B)) \leq g(L) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(B)$. If $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ are the components of ∂M we then have

$$\mathrm{Vol}(N_L(\partial M)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{Vol}(N_L(B_i)) \leq g(L) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{Vol}(B_i) \right) = g(L) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(\partial M),$$

whence the conclusion. $\square$

Let us put the estimate of Lemma 4.5 into inequality (5). We have

$$\mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)) \geq \mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon) - \mathrm{Vol}(N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)),$$

so since $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon) = \mathrm{Vol}(M)$ we get

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathrm{Vol}(M_\varepsilon \setminus N_{L+3}(\partial M_\varepsilon)) \geq \mathrm{Vol}(M) - g(L+3) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(\partial M).$$

In the same way we get $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathrm{Vol}(N_L(M_\varepsilon)) \leq \mathrm{Vol}(M) + g(L) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(\partial M)$. Therefore, if $r = \mathrm{Vol}(\partial M)/\mathrm{Vol}(M)$, then passing to the limit in the right hand side of (5) we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M)}{||\overline{M}||} \geq \frac{1 - r \cdot g(L+3)}{1 + r \cdot g(L)} \cdot V_L. \tag{6}$$

Let now $\eta < v_n$ be given. By equation (3) there exists $L_1 \geq L_0$ (only depending on n and η) such that $V_{L_1} > v_n - \eta/2$. Since $\lim_{r \to 0}(1 - r \cdot g(L_1+3))/(1 + r \cdot g(L_1)) = 1$, there exists $k > 0$ (only depending on L_1, that is on n and η) such that $(1 - r \cdot g(L_1+3))/(1 + r \cdot g(L_1)) > (v_n - \eta)/(v_n - \eta/2)$ for every $r \leq k$. Inequality (6) with $L = L_1$ now shows that if $r = \mathrm{Vol}(\partial M)/\mathrm{Vol}(M) \leq k$ then

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M)}{||\overline{M}||} \geq \frac{v_n - \eta}{v_n - \eta/2}(v_n - \eta/2) = v_n - \eta,$$

and this concludes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

REFERENCES

[Bas94] A. Basmajian, *Tubular neighborhoods of totally geodesic hypersurfaces in hyperbolic manifolds*, Invent. Math. **117** (1994), 207–225.

[BK07] M. Bucher-Karlsson, *Simplicial volume of locally symmetric spaces covered by* $SL(3,\mathbb{R})/SO(3)$, Geom. Dedicata **125** (2007), 103–224.

[BK08] ———, *The simplicial volume of closed manifolds covered by* $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$, J. Topol. **1** (2008), 584–602.

[BP92] R. Benedetti and C. Petronio, *Lectures on hyperbolic geometry*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[Fra04] S. Francaviglia, *Hyperbolic volume of representations of fundamental groups of cusped 3-manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **9** (2004), 425–459.

[Fri06] R. Frigerio, *Commensurability of hyperbolic manifolds with geodesic boundary*, Geom. Dedicata **118** (2006), 105–131.

[GPS88] M. Gromov and I. Piatetski-Shapiro, *Nonarithmetic groups in Lobachevsky spaces*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **66** (1988), 93–103.

[Gro82] M. Gromov, *Volume and bounded cohomology*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **56** (1982), 5–99.

[HM81] U. Haagerup and H. J. Munkholm, *Simplices of maximal volume in hyperbolic n-space*, Acta Math. **147** (1981), 1–11.

[Joh76] D. L. Johnson, *A short prove of the uniqueness of Haar measure*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **55** (1976), 250–251.

[Jun97] D. Jungreis, *Chains that realize the Gromov invariant of hyperbolic manifolds*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. **17** (1997), 643–648.

[Koj90] S. Kojima, *Polyhedral decomposition of hyperbolic manifolds with boundary*, Proc. Workshop Pure Math., vol. 10, 1990, pp. 37–57.

[Koj94] ———, *Geometry of hyperbolic* 3*-manifolds with boundary*, Kodai Math. J. **17** (1994), 530–537.

[Kue03] T. Kuessner, *Efficient fundamental cycles of cusped hyperbolic manifolds*, Pacific J. Math. **211** (2003), 283–313.

[Kue07] ———, *Proportionality principle for cusped manifolds*, Arch. Math. (Brno) **43** (2007), 485–490.

[Lee03] J. M. Lee, *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. 218, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[Löh06] C. Löh, *Measure homology and singular homology are isometrically isomorphic*, Math. Z. **253** (2006), 197–218.

[LS06] J.-F. Lafont and B. Schmidt, *Simplicial volume of closed locally symmetric spaces of non-compact type*, Acta Math. **197** (2006), 129–143.

[LS09] C. Löh and R. Sauer, *Degree theorems and Lipschitz simplicial volume for non-positively curved manifolds of finite volume*, J. Topology **2** (2009), 193–225.

[Pey02] N. Peyerimhoff, *Simplices of maximal volume or minimal total edge length in hyperbolic space*, J. London Math. Soc. **66** (2002), 753–768.

[Rat94] J. G. Ratcliffe, *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[Thu79] W. P. Thurston, *The geometry and topology of* 3*-manifolds*, Princeton, 1979, mimeographed notes.

[Wei65] A. Weil, *L'intègration dans les groupes topologiques et ses applications*, Paris (1965).

[Zas98] A. Zastrow, *On the (non)-coincidence of Milnor-Thurston homology theory with singular homology theory*, Pacific J. Math. (1998), 369–396.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Largo B. Pontecorvo 5, 56127 Pisa, Italy

E-mail address: `frigerio@dm.unipi.it, pagliantini@mail.dm.unipi.it`